



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Classical Studies: Faculty Publications and Other
Works

Faculty Publications

2014

Il Dossier Della “Domus Divina” in Egitto

James G. Keenan

Loyola University Chicago, jkeenan@luc.edu

Recommended Citation

Keenan, JG. "Review of Il Dossier Della 'Domus Divina' in Egitto." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 51, 2014.

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classical Studies: Faculty Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

© American Society of Papyrologists, 2014.

system. Even if some constituencies did not have recourse to petitions (e.g., rape victims), it is not because of their status. At the bottom of p. 91, "account" should be "claim," and the phrase in which it occurs should be translated "so that I retain my claim." On p. 102, "prosecution" should be "attack." On p. 121, κατέκτει[va]v (literally "they killed me") is not translated. On p. 124, "interrogate" should be "expose" (note the aorist ἀπελένγξαι).

Chapter 5 argues that the Roman Empire was distant and characterized by weak legal pluralism. I rather think that the levels of government reached all the way to the bottom, and that they were not as confusing to people there and then as we often tend to think. The weak legal pluralism also seems irrelevant, because any legal system is weak on violence (as an open concept). On p. 138, "if that man starts a quarrel, I will refrain from violence" should be "if I suffer violence and that man started it first" and connected with what follows. On p. 160, *voyn* should have been translated as *possessio*, not "right of pasturage."

The confusing title of Chapter 6, "Fusion and Fission" appears as "Fission and Fusion" in the table of contents. In this, the best, chapter B. discusses two dossiers in more depth. He places a couple of petitions in *P.Cair.Isid.* in the context of the archive, and this allows him to provide more convincing interpretations than elsewhere in the book. Instead of translating all relevant documents, B. helpfully summarizes them. Significantly, the dossier includes a reference to mediators, and the violence mentioned casually at the end of the first petition is not mentioned in the second. This exercise in contextual reading shows that the petitions that come without a context are much less meaningful (to us) than they were in the past. The other dossier discussed in Chapter 6 is the well-known petition of Dionysia, which quotes precedent and earlier decisions. Again, most other petitions are not as helpful, and Dionysia's is also not really about violence but property, a much more complicated case that required multiple hearings. On p. 180, the supralinear insert should come two words earlier (correct in B's translation). On p. 194, κατοχή is a lien, not a mortgage (that would have been ὑποθήκη).

B. writes well but drops the names of just too many critical theorists (I count over forty from Adorno to Žižek in the index). Some of his points were anticipated by Kelly (e.g., petitions are not a last resort but often hot off the press – not surprising in cases of violence), but others correct Kelly (e.g., petitions were intended to get the legal system going or to get the government to respond, not to force an informal resolution of a dispute). Kelly's more exhaustive presentation and focus on more complex issues will attract more papyrological readers.

University of Cincinnati

Peter van Minnen

Giuseppina Azzarello. *Il dossier della "domus divina" in Egitto*. Archiv für Papyrusforschung, Beiheft 32. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012. viii + 161 pages. ISBN 978-3-11-024718-3.

The book builds upon seventy references, certain (58) or conjectural (12), to the *domus divina* in Egypt. There are three major parts, labeled A, B, and C. Part A (pp. 4-52) discusses the testimonia according to defined topics. Part B (pp. 53-121) catalogues them in chronological order into what the author calls a "dossier." (Numbers and references to assured testimonia are in roman, those to conjectural ones are in italic type.) Part C (pp. 122-133) provides concordances and indices to the dossier. There are four brief appendices (pp. 134-144). One (I), by T.M. Hickey, provides an edition of P.Giss. inv. 48 (= Part B 12); the other three (II-IV), by the author, propose revised readings for three other papyri relevant to the main topic. Bibliography (pp. 145-153) and general indices (pp. 154-161) complete this compact volume.

The *domus divina* is one of those rare topics only lightly treated in A.H.M. Jones's encyclopedic *Later Roman Empire* (1964). In Giuseppina Azzarello's definition (p. 1), it consists of the ensemble of properties, scattered in certain provinces and assigned to individuals of the imperial family for their support. Egypt of course was one of those provinces (another was Cappadocia), and that for which the evidence is most abundant. It thus receives due attention in E.R. Hardy's classic *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt* (1931), but rather less or not at all in some recent studies. T.M. Hickey's *Wine, Wealth, and the State in Late Antique Egypt* (2012) is an exception.

Even for Egypt – not surprisingly – the geographical coverage is limited. As usual, Oxyrhynchite evidence from the province of Arcadia predominates; that from the village of Aphrodite of the Antaeopolite nome in the Thebaid comes in second. The dossier contains a wealth of prosopographical data (which perhaps could have been deployed in a hypothetical Part D) by means of which the author is able (pp. 9-28) to posit a scheme of administration from the bottom up. At the local level was the *prostasia* under contractual supervision of a *pronoetes*. At the *dioikesis* or nome level we find the *dioiketes*; at the provincial level, the *phrontistes*, and beyond that, though more hypothetically, the *kourator*, perhaps based in Constantinople (see esp. SB 6.9102 = 36). It was of course possible, though attestations are few, for individuals like Flavius Strategios I, *dioiketes* and then *phrontistes*, to move up the ladder from one position to the next. Numerous names and jobs of other personnel ("altre persone") are known, some permanently, others temporarily in service to the *domus divina* as, for example, irrigators, potters, wine dealers, porters (*kobaleuontes*, 22.2-4), and shippers. These are presented in a running sequence

(pp. 32-39). It would be a challenge to organize them according to type in such a way as to assess the degree to which the means of exploiting imperial properties mirrored those for private properties. At the very least the listing gives an impression of the variety of requisite human capital for the successful operation of estates of either kind.

The dossier provides some precise evidence for the localities in which *domus divina* land was to be found and a certain amount of information on the *post mortem* transfer of properties from one imperial family member to another, e.g., from Arcadia to Eudocia, from Theodora to Justinian. Most intriguing is the movement of former *domus divina* land into the control of the Apions of Oxyrhynchus, whether into their ownership or, if one prefers the thesis of J. Gascou (now reprinted in his *Fiscalité et société en Égypte byzantine* [2008] 125-213), into their tax-collecting "share." Unfortunately, the papyri give no direct figures on the extent of imperial landed interests in Egypt even for the two main regions for which they provide evidence. Jairus Banaji nonetheless notes (*Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity* [2001] 149-150) that in *P.Oxy.* 16.2020 (= 50, AD 567-588), an account of "fiscal charges owed to the praetorian prefecture" (Hickey, *Wine, Wealth, and the State*, 110, n. 89), paid in kind by various Oxyrhynchite *oikoi*, the *domus divina* at 22.2% of the whole was "the single biggest payer." This at least suggests the magnitude of imperial landed interests in one particular nome.

No single type of document prevails in the author's dossier. Instead the documents are various in genre: letters, lists, petitions, epistolary instructions, receipts, contracts (sale, loan, lease), oaths, receipts for irrigation machinery parts, work contracts. Some famous pieces are treated at length. The longest discussion (pp. 82-88) is justifiably reserved for 36 (*SB* 6.9102), a letter written in Constantinople to the duke of the Thebaid concerning the villagers of Aphrodite. Some discussions (e.g., for 1, 3, 42, 60) are single paragraphs. The mean may be represented by 49 (= *P.Cair.Masp.* 1.67002), the famous petition of the villagers of Aphrodite to the duke of the Thebaid (pp. 101-103).

As mentioned, Part B's catalogue, which presents extracts, not full texts, that refer or allude to the *domus divina* or its personnel, adopts a chronological order. This effectively, and perhaps unfortunately, separates papyri of the same provenance. The Greek is printed continuously, not line-by-line. There is careful introductory discussion of each extract's personae, its clear or possible link to the *domus divina*. Full context is given in these introductions, but there are no translations, though I think these should have been presented for some of the thornier passages, hard to construe without their surrounding texts. The discussion for each testimonium is composed in such a way that each can stand on its own. This does result in much formulaic repetition and hundreds of in-

ternal cross-references. The system for the latter is not especially user-friendly since it is not based on pages but on references to parts and sub-parts, for instance on p. 53, "cf. sopra, al punto A, 3, a con n. 58 e 4 con n. 116." It is after all, since the footnotes are numbered consecutively throughout the volume, easier to track the cross-references by their corollary footnote numbers (here 58 and 116) than by their principal indicators (A, 3, a and 4). But trying to provide paginated cross-references would have been a nightmarish endeavor and possibly, in the end, would have been a less helpful tool.

Finally, the author is meticulous in verifying readings of the extracts she presents, if not against the originals then by frequent consultation of online images. She has produced a valuable and reliable compendium of evidence, a timely reminder of a topic that because of the diffuse nature of relevant references can easily escape notice. It is good to see them brought together here for the first time.

Loyola University Chicago

James G. Keenan